



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,390	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030238US1	7557

46797 7590 09/24/2010

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

HARPER, ELIYAH STONE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/24/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/600,390
Filing Date: June 20, 2003
Appellant(s): CHATTERJEE ET AL.

Gero G. McClellan (Reg. No. 44,227)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/6/2010 appealing from the Office action mailed 2/19/2010.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:
9, 11-18, 25, 36 and 37.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the

subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6687878	Eintracht et al.	3-1999
7010144	Davis et al.	1-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 9, 11-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6687878 (Eintracht) in view of US 7010144 (hereinafter Davis)

As for claim 9 Eintracht discloses: a data store storing a plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 34-45); a plurality of different applications for editing the plurality of data objects (See column 5 lines 65-67, and column 1 lines 55-60) wherein each application performs a different type of editing and wherein a relationship is defined between each data object and a respective application for editing the respective data object (See column 8 lines 40-46) an annotation store storing one or more annotations annotating the plurality of data objects edited the plurality of different applications (See column 6 lines 45-48), and an annotation browser configured to access, by operation of one or more computer processors (See column 7 lines 25-30) Eintracht does not disclose: the annotation store and provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing the one or more annotations wherein the annotation browser is configured to display the one or more annotations along with selectable links from each of the one or more annotations to at least one of the plurality of data objects annotated by the respective annotation of the one or more annotations; and wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective data object to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective data object. Davis however does disclose: the annotation store and provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing the one or more annotations (See column 2 lines 40-50) wherein the annotation browser is

configured to display the one or more annotations along with selectable links from each of the one or more annotations to at least one of the plurality of data objects annotated by the respective annotation of the one or more annotations (See column 6 lines 14-24); and wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective data object to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective data object (See column 3 lines 15-20 and figure 3 noting that the application must be compliant application). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Davis into the system of Eintracht. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Davis's teaching would enable user's of the Eintracht system to embed annotations steganographically into the displayed data (See Davis column 1 lines 55-67).

As for claim 11 the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Eintracht discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display data and indications of what displayed data has one or more corresponding annotations (See column 7 lines 55-67).

As for claim 12 the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Eintracht discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display one or more annotation icons proximate to an annotated data object (See column 15 lines 15-20).

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further Eintracht discloses: wherein: at least one common annotation describes more than one data object (See column 15 lines 35-37), and the annotation browser is configured to display a common annotation icon proximate to data objects described by the common annotation (See column 15 lines 30-35 note: the icons can be graphics themselves).

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Eintracht discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display different annotation icons proximate to data objects described by different annotations (See column 15 lines 24-28).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Eintracht discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 14 lines 29-34)

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Eintracht discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an

associated annotation icon (See column 15 lines 15-20 note: cursor must move over checkbox).

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further Eintracht disclose: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See column 14 lines 30-40).

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further Eintracht discloses wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, retrieve the second portion of annotation data from the annotation store (See column 7 lines 1-10).

As for claim 25 Eintracht discloses: a data store storing a plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 34-45); a plurality of different applications for editing the plurality of data objects (See column 5 lines 65-67, and column 1 lines 55-60) wherein each application performs a different type of editing and wherein a relationship is defined between each data object and a respective application for editing the respective data object (See column 8 lines 40-46) an annotation database storing a plurality of annotations (See column 6 lines 25-28), wherein the plurality of annotations are stored separately from the plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 45-55); a set of data object points (See column 7 lines 63-67), each data object point comprising an

annotatable portion of one of the plurality of data objects (See column 7 lines 55-60) , wherein one or more of the set of data object points is annotated by one or more of the plurality of annotations (See column 8 line 65- column 9 line 3); a set of plug-in components (See column 8 lines 28-30), each interfacing between one or more annotation applications and an annotation server (See column 8 lines 34-43), wherein the annotation server is configured to: (i) receive, via the plug-in components, requests to access the plurality of annotations (See column 10 lines 34-40), the requests issued by the one or more annotation applications and (ii) generate a graphical user interface screen, based on an annotation structure associated with one or more of the set of data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for one or more of the set of data object points (See figure 1 b); and a browser application configured to browse the plurality of annotations in the annotation database, wherein the browser application is configured to: (i) access, by operation of one or more computer processors (See column 7 lines 25-30). Eintracht does not disclose: a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of annotation fields selected to capture annotations of a specific type of data object point. the plurality of annotations independently of the annotation applications in which the plurality of annotations were created and (ii) display the plurality of annotations along with selectable links from each of the plurality of annotations to at least one data object point annotated by each annotation, wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective annotated data object point to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective annotated data object Davis does however

disclose: a set of annotation structures (See column 10 lines 20-30), each defining a set of annotation fields selected to capture annotations of a specific type of data object point (See column 10 lines 30-35); the plurality of annotations independently of the annotation applications in which the plurality of annotations were created (See column 2 lines 40-50) and (ii) display the plurality of annotations along with selectable links from each of the plurality of annotations to at least one data object point annotated by each annotation (See column 6 lines 14-24), wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective annotated data object point to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective annotated data object (See column 3 lines 15-20 and figure 3 noting that the application must be compliant application). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Davis into the system of Eintracht. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Davis's teaching would enable user's of the Eintracht system to embed annotations steganographically into the displayed data (See Davis column 1 lines 55-67).

As for claim 36 Eintracht discloses: an annotation database storing a plurality of annotations (See column 6 lines 25-28), a data store storing a plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 34-45); a set of data object points (See column 7 lines 63-67), each data object point being an annotatable portion of one of the plurality of data objects (See column 7 lines 55-60) , wherein one or more of the set of data object points is annotated by one or more of the plurality of annotations (See column 8 line 65- column 9 line 3); a set of index tables indexing the one or more of the set of data object points annotated by the one or more of the plurality of annotations (See column 9 lines 15-25) , wherein each index table corresponds to a different type of data object point (See column 8 lines 15-25). a plurality of different applications for editing the plurality of data objects (See column 5 lines 65-67, and column 1 lines 55-60) wherein each application performs a different type of editing and wherein a relationship is defined between each data object and a respective application for editing the respective data object (See column 8 lines 40-46) wherein the plurality of annotations are stored separately from the plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 45-55); a set of administration tools configured for creating and modifying the set of annotation structures a client computer comprising a set of plug-in components (See column 8 lines 28-30), each interfacing between one or more annotation applications and an annotation server (See column 8 lines 34-43), wherein the annotation server is configured to: (i) receive, via the plug-in components, requests to access the plurality of annotations (See column 10 lines 34-40), the requests issued by the one or more annotation applications and (ii) generate a graphical user interface screen, based on an annotation structure associated with one

or more of the set of data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for one or more of the set of data object points (See figure 1 b); an annotation broker managing messages passing between the annotation server and the set of plug-in components (See column 7 lines 25-35) and a browser application configured to browse the plurality of annotations in the annotation database, wherein the browser application is configured to: (i) access, by operation of one or more computer processors, and a communications network providing connectivity between the client computer and the annotation server (See column 7 lines 25-30). Eintracht does not disclose: a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of annotation fields selected to capture annotations of a specific type of data object point and each corresponding to a specific combination of user role and data scope. the plurality of annotations independently of the annotation applications in which the plurality of annotations were created and (ii) display the plurality of annotations along with selectable links from each of the plurality of annotations to at least one data object point annotated by each annotation, wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective annotated data object point to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective annotated data object. Davis does however disclose: a set of annotation structures (See column 10 lines 20-30), each defining a set of annotation fields selected to capture annotations of a specific type of data object point and each corresponding to a specific combination of user role and data scope (See column 10 lines 30-35); the plurality of annotations independently of the annotation applications in which the plurality of annotations were created (See

column 2 lines 40-50) and (ii) display the plurality of annotations along with selectable links from each of the plurality of annotations to at least one data object point annotated by each annotation (See column 6 lines 14-24), wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective annotated data object point to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective annotated data object (See column 3 lines 15-20 and figure 3 noting that the application must be compliant application). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Davis into the system of Eintracht. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Davis's teaching would enable user's of the Eintracht system to embed annotations steganographically into the displayed data (See Davis column 1 lines 55-67).

As for claim 37 Eintracht discloses: a data store storing a plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 34-45); a plurality of different applications for editing the plurality of data objects (See column 5 lines 65-67, and column 1 lines 55-60) wherein

each application performs a different type of editing and wherein a relationship is defined between each data object and a respective application for editing the respective data object (See column 8 lines 40-46); an annotation database storing a plurality of annotations wherein the annotations are stored separately from the plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 25-28), a set of data object points (See column 7 lines 63-67), each data object point being an annotatable portion of one of the plurality of data objects (See column 7 lines 55-60), wherein one or more of the set of data object points is annotated by one or more of the plurality of annotations (See column 8 line 65-column 9 line 3); a set of index tables indexing the one or more of the set of data object points annotated by the one or more of the plurality of annotations (See column 9 lines 15-25), wherein each index table corresponds to a different type of data object point (See column 8 lines 15-25), wherein the plurality of annotations are stored separately from the plurality of data objects (See column 6 lines 45-55); a set of plug-in components (See column 8 lines 28-30), each interfacing between one or more annotation applications and an annotation server (See column 8 lines 34-43), wherein the annotation server is configured to: (i) receive, via the plug-in components, requests to access the plurality of annotations (See column 10 lines 34-40), the requests issued by the one or more annotation applications and (ii) generate a graphical user interface screen, based on an annotation structure associated with one or more of the set of data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for one or more of the set of data object points (See figure 1 b); a browser application configured to browse the plurality of annotations in the annotation database, wherein the browser application is configured

to: (i) access, by operation of one or more computer processors(See column 7 lines 25-30). wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 14 lines 29-34). wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an associated annotation icon (See column 15 lines 15-20 note: cursor must move over checkbox)wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See column 14 lines 30-40). Eintracht does not disclose: a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of annotation fields selected to capture annotations of a specific type of data object point. The plurality of annotations independently of the annotation applications in which the plurality of annotations were created and (ii) display the plurality of annotations along with selectable links from each of the plurality of annotations to at least one data object point annotated by each annotation, wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective annotated data object point to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective annotated data object. Davis does however disclose: a set of annotation structures (See column 10 lines 20-30), each defining a set of annotation fields selected to capture annotations of a specific type of data object point and each corresponding to a specific combination of user role and data scope (See column 10 lines 30-35); the

plurality of annotations independently of the annotation applications in which the plurality of annotations were created (See column 2 lines 40-50) and (ii) display the plurality of annotations along with selectable links from each of the plurality of annotations to at least one data object point annotated by each annotation (See column 6 lines 14-24), wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective annotated data object point to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective annotated data object (See column 3 lines 15-20 and figure 3 noting that the application must be compliant application). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Davis into the system of Eintracht. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references. In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Davis's teaching would enable user's of the Eintracht system to embed annotations steganographically into the displayed data (See Davis column 1 lines 55-67).

(10) Response to Argument

This Examiner's answer will address the arguments in the order in which they appear in the appeal brief.

Argument (1): the Office suggests that Davis discloses annotation browser user interfaces for viewing annotations to data objects. Specifically, the Office suggests that Davis discloses the limitations of "an annotation browser configured to... provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing the one or more annotations [annotating a plurality of data objects edited by a plurality of different applications for editing the plurality of data objects, wherein each application performs a different type of editing]" and "wherein the annotation browser is configured to display the one or more annotations along with selectable links from each of the one or more annotations to at least one of the plurality of data objects annotated by the respective annotation of the one or more annotations."

Davis is directed to associating metadata with graphical images. See Davis, Abstract. In this regard, the Office is suggesting that the metadata of Davis teaches the recited annotations and that the graphical images of Davis teach the recited data object. The cited portions of Davis disclose a scrollable list of predefined metadata from which a user may select to associate with a graphical image. See Davis, col. 6, lines 14-24. Respectfully, Davis fails to disclose any annotation browser that displays the metadata that has an association with ,graphical images and selectable links from each of the metadata to at least one of the ,graphical images. Instead, the cited portions of Davis disclose a graphical user interface from which a user may select predefined metadata

that is not yet associated with any graphical image. That is, at the time that the user selects from the predefined metadata in Davis, the predefined metadata does not have any association with a graphical image. In contrast, the claims are directed to annotations that have an association with an underlying data object. Davis simply does not teach any user interface for viewing annotations that have an association with underlying data objects. Further, the claims recite a user interface for viewing metadata associated with objects edited by a plurality of different applications, wherein each application performs a different type of editing. Respectfully, even assuming, arguendo, that Davis teaches an image editing application associated with the images, Davis still fails to teach a second type of application that performs a different type of editing, as required by the claims. For the reasons given above, Davis fails to disclose at least "an annotation browser configured to... provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing the one or more annotations" and "wherein the annotation browser is configured to display the one or more annotations along with selectable links from each of the one or more annotations to at least one of the plurality of data objects annotated by the respective annotation of the one or more annotations." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be reversed.

In response to argument (1) examiner respectfully submits that Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation: During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable

interpretation consistent with the specification.’ Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case the claims require a teaching of “an annotation browser configured to provide one or more graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing the one or more annotations”

An annotation is simply a note or another form of data that is added to something for purposes of explanation, ease of use retrieval etc. The metadata in Davis is a form of annotations the user is allowed to specify types of data including time, place, subject (See Davis column 2 lines 60-65). The user specifying of the metadata or annotation data can be specified through the actual image capture device such as a camera with a user interface (See Davis column 2 lines 60-67) However the user can also view and create the metadata types using the more user friendly interfaces of a personal computer application (See Davis column 3 lines 1-8). Moreover in addition to specifying the type of data or annotation a user can actually create the data associated with that form of data (See column 3 lines 6-15) Thus a user can create the annotation and view their creation via the display in the Davis reference.

The claims also state that “annotations along with selectable links from each of the one or more annotations to at least one of the plurality of data objects.” This claim limitation means that the interface displays a link that connects the one or more annotations to the image data Davis discloses links that associate the image with the annotation or desired data (See column 3 lines 15-20).

Argument (2): Further, the Office suggests that Davis discloses "wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective data object to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective data object." Generally, Davis teaches that an image viewer that adheres to standard guidelines for maintaining image metadata may embed metadata in a graphical image. The image viewer may also steganographically hide an identifier in the graphical image. Should a non-compliant application ever remove or corrupt the embedded metadata, the identifier may be used to retrieve a copy of the metadata (from the metadata server) to restore the embedded metadata in the graphical image. Respectfully, Davis fails to disclose displaying image metadata and a selectable link from the image metadata to graphical image, as required by the claims. Further, Davis also fails to disclose that selecting any one of the selectable links causes an application for editing , graphical images to be invoked. Davis teaches that an image may include an embedded descriptor - which may include either text or a reference to the text stored outside the image. Respectfully, Davis fails to teach that selecting the text (or the reference to the text) causes a respective application for editing the image to be invoked according to the predefined relationship, as claimed. Therefore, Davis fails to disclose "wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes the respective application for editing the respective data object to be invoked according to the defined relationship between the respective application and the respective data object." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be reversed.

In response to argument (2): examiner respectfully submits that Initially examiner notes that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case Davis discloses that a plurality of applications will use the image and the links associated with the image (See Davis column 11 lines 25-40). Various editing application are specifically what the claims require and while there is no explicit mentioning of a particular application the claims do not claim a particular application and Davis clearly discloses that the system is designed to have a plurality of different applications use and read the links and images (See column 11 lines 41-51) Moreover the "Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art." In *re Keller, Terry, and Davies*, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Argument (3): Further, regarding claim 37, the Office suggests that Eintracht discloses "wherein the browser application is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations." Generally, Eintracht is directed to synchronizing annotations from multiple clients. Respectfully, Eintracht fails

to disclose displaying a first icon to indicate that a document has a single note and displaying a second icon to indicate that a document has multiple notes. Therefore, Eintracht fails to teach "wherein the browser application is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be reversed with respect to claim 37.

In response to argument (3): examiner respectfully submits that Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation: During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case the claim limitation in questions reads "displaying a first icon to indicate that a document has a single note and displaying a second icon to indicate that a document has multiple notes." Therefore the icon only needs to be able to indicate to the user that there is one annotation or more than one annotation. Eintracht discloses: in figure 1b and column 7 lines 1-16 that each icon represents an annotation accordingly if each icon represents an an annotation then obviously the first icon represents one annotation and the second icon indicates the presence of another annotation.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Conclusion

Claims 1-7 and 22 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). In light of the foregoing arguments, the Examiner respectfully requests that the Honorable Board of Appeals sustain the rejections.

Respectfully submitted,
Elijah S. Harper
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2166
/ELIJAH S HARPER/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166

Conferees

1. Hosain Alam, Supervisory Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166
/Hosain T Alam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166

2. Kavita Padmanabhan , Primary Examiner Art Unit 2161
/Kavita Padmanabhan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161

Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Tel: (713) 623-4844
Fax: (713) 623-4846